UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/586,136	12/06/2006	Anton Christian Lauridsen	2836-0160PUS1	3839

2292   7590   03/06/2009
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER
KRISHNAN, VIVEK V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2445	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/06/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/586,136	LAURIDSEN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	VIVEK KRISHNAN	2445

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>22 December 2008</u>.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-29</u> is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-29</u> is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a) ☒ All   b) ☐ Some *   c) ☐ None of:
        1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
        2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
        3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to the Amendment/Arguments filed on December 22, 2008. Claims 1,

19, and 29 have been amended. Claims 1-29 are pending.

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments with respect to Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and 35

U.S.C. 103(a) have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claim 1-10, 17, 19-21, 27, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0031357 A1 to Misra et al.

(hereinafter "Misra") and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0088286 to Hackleman

et al. (hereinafter "Hackleman")

4.   Regarding Claims 1, 19, and 29, Misra discloses an electronic mail management system,

method, and computer usable medium (hereinafter referred to as the system) for handling

electronic mail in a shared multiple user environment, in which the users' incoming electronic

mail are sent and received from external correspondents, said system includes a common mail

server with a central storage wherein electronic mail items of the users are stored and may be

retrieved, said system comprising:

> detecting means for monitoring the flow of in- and outbound electronic mails on the mail

server for a specified set of users, and intercepting the in- and outbound e-mails (Misra;

paragraphs 37, 75, and 77, discloses means for monitoring and intercepting incoming and

outgoing e-mails);

> journalising means for creating a notification record of a set of e-mail information data

for each of the intercepted electronic mails (Misra; paragraphs 66 and 92, discloses creating

metadata records associated with each of the intercepted e-mails);

> an electronic mail manager database (EMM DB) for storing said notification records and

the associated electronic mails in a relation database so that the notification records and the

associated electronic mails are accessible for the users in the multiple users environment by a

search query (Misra; paragraphs 37, 65, 66, and 88-92, discloses storing the metadata records in

an archive database and the associated e-mails in an archive, also referred to as a network data

storage system, and making the associated e-mails accessible to users by search query); and

> means for establishing a journal of electronic mails from the notification records in the

electronic mail management database by defining a search request query and submitting said

search request to a search engine for selecting a user-defined series of information data from the

notification records in the electronic mail management database (Misra; paragraphs 79, 80, 85,

88-92, and 93-97, discloses establishing a list of e-mails from the metadata records by defining

and submitting a search query for selecting information from the metadata records in the archive

database).

Misra does not explicitly disclose, however discloses that *all* the notification records and

all the associated electronic mails are accessible for *all* the users (Hackleman; paragraphs 52 and

54; discloses user access to all corporate emails to facilitate a collaborative environment).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify a database providing user access to emails, as disclosed by Misra, to include

providing all users with access to all emails in the database, as disclosed by Hackleman, in order

to provide a system that enhances network collaboration.

5.   Regarding Claims 2 and 20, Misra and Hackleman disclose each and every limitation of

claims 1 and 19. Misra further discloses wherein the detection means include means for

formatting each intercepted electronic mail (Misra; paragraphs 37 and 68, discloses formatting

each intercepted e-mail into a flat-file).

6.   Regarding Claims 3 and 21, Misra and Hackleman disclose each and every limitation of

claims 2 and 20. Misra further discloses wherein the detection means further include means for

copying the formatted electronic mail to the electronic mail manager database (EMM DB)

(Misra; paragraph 37, discloses storing the formatted e-mail in the archive).

7.   Regarding Claim 4, Misra and Hackleman disclose each and every limitation of claims 1-3. Misra further discloses wherein electronic mail management relation database is hosted on a SQL server (Misra; paragraph 92, discloses the archive database is hosted on a SQL server to which SQL queries are made).

8.   Regarding Claim 5, Misra and Hackleman disclose each and every limitation of claim 4. Misra further discloses wherein the means for establishing a journal involves a search according to at least one selection criterion in the notification record for establishing a journal of e-mails among the entries in the electronic mail management database (Misra; paragraphs 88-89, discloses establishing the list of e-mails from the emails in the archive database involves a search according to at least one selection criteria in the metadata record).

9.   Regarding Claim 6, Misra and Hackleman disclose each and every limitation of claim 5. Misra further discloses wherein the data in the notification record includes a notification message for each e-mail, said notification message containing e-mail header information including at least one of the following data:

        time of receipt (date);

        information concerning the sender ("from") (Misra; paragraph 92, discloses the metadata record including sender information);

        information concerning the recipient or recipients ("to") (Misra; paragraph 92, discloses the metadata record including recipient information);

        information regarding copy recipients ("cc") and/or blind copy recipients ("bcc");

message identification;

      reference data, such as "in reply to";

      subject (Misra; paragraph 92, discloses the metadata record including subject\);

comments; and

      keywords.

10.   Regarding Claim 7, Misra and Hackleman disclose each and every limitation of claim 6. Misra further discloses wherein said electronic mail management system (EMM) is adapted to cooperate with any SMTP protocol based e-mail systems (Misra; paragraphs 113 and 119, discloses the system is adapted to cooperate with SMTP based e-mail systems).

11.   Regarding Claim 8, Misra and Hackleman disclose each and every limitation of claim 7. Misra further discloses wherein the specified set of users being subjected to the detection means is all users in the multiple user environment is at least two users (Misra; Figure 2, discloses two users as part of the system).

12.   Regarding Claims 17 and 27, Misra and Hackleman disclose each and every limitation of claims 8 and 21. Misra further discloses wherein the means for establishing a journal of e-mails is adapted for providing a multiple of journals (Misra; paragraphs 79, 80, 85, and 88-92, discloses providing multiple lists based on a multiple of different search queries).

13.   Regarding Claim 9, Misra and Hackleman disclose each and every limitation of claim 8. Misra does not explicitly disclose wherein the multiple-user environment is a multi-site customer environment, each site having a local client server.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the multiple-user environment, as disclosed by Misra, such that the user systems in the multiple-user environment are customer client server systems in order to apply the searchable e-mail database system to a normal business environment as intended by Misra (Misra; paragraphs 7-9). A person of ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the known options within his or her technical grasp. If this leads to the anticipated success, it is likely the product not of innovation but of ordinary skill and common sense. See *KSR v. Teleflex*, 550 U.S. ___, 127 S. Ct. 1727 (2007).

14.   Regarding Claim 10, Misra and Hackleman disclose each and every limitation of claim 8. Misra does not explicitly disclose wherein the multiple-user environment is a single-site customer environment, having a single client server.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the multiple-user environment, as disclosed by Misra, such that the user system in the multiple-user environment is a customer client server system in order to apply the searchable e-mail database system to a normal business environment as intended by Misra (Misra; paragraphs 7-9). A person of ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the known options within his or her technical grasp. If this leads to the anticipated success, it is likely the

product not of innovation but of ordinary skill and common sense. See *KSR v. Teleflex*, 550 U.S.

___, 127 S. Ct. 1727 (2007).

15.   Claims 11, 13, 22, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Misra and Hackleman as applied to claims 1 and 19 above, and further in view of Microsoft®

Office System Inside Out: 2003 Edition to Young et al. (hereinafter 'Young').

16.   Regarding Claims 11 and 22, Misra and Hackleman disclose each and every limitation of

claims 1 and 19. Misra does not explicitly disclose, but Young discloses wherein the means for

establishing a journal include an e-mail management dialog means for each user for indicating

arrival and departure of e-mails (Young; Chapter 38, discloses an inbox and outbox which are

used to indicate the arrival and departure of e-mails to a user).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify an e-mail management system, as disclosed by Misra, to include means for

indicating the arrival and departure of e-mails to a user, as disclosed by Young.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been

motivated to make this modification in order to provide a functional interface to a user in an e-

mail system.

17.   Regarding Claims 13 and 24, Misra, Hackleman, and Young disclose each and every

limitation of claims 11 and 22. Misra further discloses wherein said dialog means provide for

automatic journalising for each arriving and departing e-mail (Misra; paragraph 80, discloses

automatically adding e-mails to the queried list).

18.   Claims 12 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Misra,

Hackleman, and Young, as applied to claims 11 and 22 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent

Application Publication No. 2004/0133645 A1 to Massanelli et al. (hereinafter 'Massanelli').

19.   Regarding Claims 12 and 23, Misra, Hackleman, and Young disclose each and every

limitation of claims 11 and 22. Misra does not explicitly disclose, but Massanelli discloses

wherein said dialog means provide for seeking consent for journalising for each arriving and

departing e-mail (Massanelli; paragraphs 9 and 37, discloses seeking consent for cataloging

arriving and departing e-mails using selection criteria).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify the dialog means, as disclosed by Misra, to include means for seeking

consent for journalizing for each arriving and departing e-mail, as disclosed by Massanelli.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been

motivated to make this modification in order to selectively capture relevant emails (Massanelli;

paragraph 9).

20.   Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Misra and

Hackleman as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,230,156 B1 to

Hussey.

21.   Regarding Claim 14, Misra and Hackleman disclose each and every limitation of claim 8.

Misra further discloses wherein the electronic mail journalising means includes:

          a notification queue (Misra; paragraph 44, discloses an e-mail queue),

          a notification server (Misra; paragraph 75, discloses an e-mail server),

          a notification loader (Misra; paragraph 44, discloses an e-mail queue and therefore a

loader for loading the queue), and

          the e-mail management relation database storage (Misra; paragraph 66, discloses an

archive database for e-mail management).

          Misra does not explicitly disclose, but Hussey discloses a notification scheduler (Hussey;

Figure 2, column 1 lines 40-67, column 2 lines 1-11, column 3 lines 44-47, and column 4 lines 3-

14, discloses a scheduler used in updating a database of e-mails).

          It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify the journalizing means, as disclosed by Misra, to include a notification

scheduler, as disclosed by Hussey.

          One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been

motivated to make this modification in order to reduce the incidence of system bottlenecks

(Hussey; column 3 lines 44-47).

22.   Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Misra,

Hackleman, and Hussey, as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Massanelli.

23.   Regarding Claim 15, Misra, Hackleman, and Hussey disclose each and every limitation

of claim 14. Misra does not explicitly disclose, but Massanelli discloses wherein the notification

scheduler include means for updating the journalising means, said updating means include a

predefined journalisable acceptance criterion (Massanelli; paragraphs 9 and 37, discloses

predefined selection criterion for cataloging e-mails).

        It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify the notification scheduler, as disclosed by Misra, to include a means for

updating the journalizing means, said updating means including a predefined journalisable

acceptance criterion, as disclosed by Massanelli.

        One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been

motivated to make this modification in order to selectively capture relevant emails (Massanelli;

paragraph 9).

24.   Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Misra,

Hackleman, Hussey, and Massanelli, as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of U.S.

Patent No. 6,438,582 B1 to Hsiao et al. (hereinafter 'Hsiao').

25.   Regarding Claims 16, Misra, Hackleman, Hussey, and Massanelli disclose each and

every limitation of claim 15. Misra does not explicitly disclose, but Hsiao discloses wherein said

journalisable acceptance criterion being either if the specific e-mail is sent to more users, all

users must accept the specific e-mail to be journalised, or if only one of the users accepts the

specific e-mail for journalising, the journalising is performed (Hsiao; column 3 lines 23-53,

discloses requiring unanimous agreement of users in order to perform a transaction).

        It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify the journalizable acceptance criterion, as disclosed by Misra, as modified by

Hussey and Massanelli, to include performing the journalization if all the users agree to it, as

disclosed by Hsiao.

        One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been

motivated to make this modification in order to obtain unanimous consent of all participants

(Hsiao; column 3 lines 23-53).

26.   Claims 18 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Misra

and Hackleman, as applied to claims 17 and 27 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No.

7,149,733 B2 to Lin et al. (hereinafter 'Lin').

27.   Regarding Claims 18 and 28, Misra and Hackleman disclose each and every limitation of

claims 17 and 27. Misra does not explicitly disclose, but Lin discloses where a journal is

established by comparing two or more of said multiple of journals by Boolean operators (Lin;

column 1 lines 6-24, discloses establishing a table by comparing/combining multiple tables using Boolean operators).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify establishing a journal, as disclosed by Misra, to include establishing a journal by comparing two or more journals by Boolean operators, as disclosed by Lin.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to make this modification in order to provide a means for establishing a journal in a database system using existing journals.

28.   Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Misra and Hackleman, as applied to claim 21 above, and further in view of Massanelli.

29.   Regarding Claim 25, Misra and Hackleman disclose each and every limitation of claim 21. Misra does not explicitly disclose, but Massanelli discloses wherein the e-mail journalising step includes updating the journalising means, said updating means include a predefined journalisable acceptance criterion (Massanelli; paragraphs 9 and 37, discloses predefined selection criterion for cataloging e-mails).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the e-mail journalizing step, as disclosed by Misra, to include updating the journalizing means, said updating means including a predefined journalisable acceptance criterion, as disclosed by Massanelli.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to make this modification in order to selectively capture relevant emails (Massanelli; paragraph 9).

30.	Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Misra, Hackleman, and Massanelli, as applied to claim 25 above, and further in view of Hsiao.

31.	Regarding Claims 26, Misra, Hackleman, and Massanelli disclose each and every limitation of claim 25. Misra does not explicitly disclose, however Hsiao discloses wherein said journalisable acceptance criterion is either if the specific e-mail is sent to more users, that all users must accept the specific e-mail to be journalised, or if only one of the users accepts the specific e-mail for journalising, the journalising is performed (Hsiao; column 3 lines 23-53, discloses requiring unanimous agreement of users in order to perform a transaction).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the journalizable acceptance criterion, as disclosed by Misra, to include performing the journalization if all the users agree to it, as disclosed by Hsiao.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to make this modification in order to obtain unanimous consent of all participants (Hsiao; column 3 lines 23-53).

Conclusion

32.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

U.S. Patent No. 7,194,516 B2 to Giacobbe et al. – discloses querying and journalizing e-mail

stored in a relational database.

U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0199529 A1 to Clark et al. – discloses cataloging

and retrieving e-mail messages stored in a database.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to VIVEK KRISHNAN whose telephone number is (571) 270-

5009. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:00 AM to 5:30

PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached on (571) 276-9456. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Patrice Winder/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2445

/V. K./
Examiner, Art Unit 2445